



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,500	03/01/2002	Jeffrey W. Ronne	GP-301390	3019

7590 04/11/2006
LAURA C. HARGITT
General Motors Corporation
Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21
P.O. Box 300
Detroit, MI 48265-3000

EXAMINER

ROSENBERG, LAURA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3616

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/087,500	Applicant(s) RONNE ET AL.	
	Examiner Laura B. Rosenberg	Art Unit 3616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7, 8 and 10 is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 9 and 11 is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
--	--

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed 26 September 2005, in which a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 was filed.

Drawings

2. The drawings were received on 26 September 2005. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 7, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al. (6,082,761) in view of Van Buren, Jr. et al. (4,610,588).

Kato et al. disclose a roof-rail air bag assembly (including #M1) for a vehicle having a roof rail (including #28), the assembly comprising:

- Air bag module (#M1) including an air bag inflator (#18) and an air bag (#11) with at least one cushion retention tab (including #15)
- Snap-in clip (including #24) able to be attached to the roof rail and to the cushion retention tab (best seen in figures 3-5)

- Inflator bracket (including #19) having an inflator support portion (including #20) and an attachment portion (including #21) with a mounting tab (#21)
- Installation of the air bag module to the vehicle is accomplished by inserting the snap-in clip into the roof rail (best seen in figures 3, 4)
- Assembly able to be installed in the roof rail from outside the vehicle (by reaching into the vehicle from the outside)

Kato et al. do not disclose the snap-in clip being permanently attachable to the roof rail and selectively attachable to the cushion retention tab, the snap-in clip including a fastening portion, or a removable serviceability attachment feature.

Van Buren, Jr. et al. teach an assembly (best seen in figure 1) able to be used in a vehicle (see Background of Invention) having a first vehicle component (for example, including workpiece #C), the assembly comprising:

- Snap-in clip (including retainer clip #A) able to be permanently attached to the roof rail (via #36a, 36b) and selectively attached to the air bag mounting portion (for example, via legs #12, 14), and including a fastening portion (including #16)
- Removable serviceability attachment feature (for example, including fastener #B) able to attach a second vehicle component (for example, including second workpiece #D) to the snap-in clip by fastening the serviceability attachment feature to the fastening portion of the snap-in clip (best seen in figures 1, 3; columns 5-6), and able to selectively detach the second vehicle component from the snap-in clip for removal of the second vehicle component by removing the serviceability attachment feature from the fastening portion of the snap-in clip (for

example, fastener can be removed by using the same driving tool on slot #48 as is used during the assembly process)

- Installation of the second vehicle component to the vehicle is accomplished by inserting the snap-in clip into the first vehicle component (best seen in figures 1, 4; columns 3-6)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the air bag module assembly of Kato et al. such that it comprised a snap-in clip being permanently attachable to the roof rail and selectively attachable to the cushion retention tab, the snap-in clip including a fastening portion, and a removable serviceability attachment feature as claimed in view of the teachings of Van Buren, Jr. et al. so as to provide for an inexpensive fastener that is easy to install in blind operations, such as in the installation of a roof rail air bag assembly.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7, 8, and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2-5, 9, and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the allowable subject matter is the connection of the inflator with the serviceability attachment feature, snap-in-clip, and/or cushion retention tab, in combination with other features of the claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Acevedo discloses a removable serviceability attachment feature that can be used with two components in a vehicle.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3616

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura B. Rosenberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-6674. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on (571) 272-6669. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Laura B Rosenberg
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3616

LBR



PAUL N. DICKSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3616